UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,231	01/31/2006	Peter Von Zimmermann	07781.0228	2141

22852   7590   09/22/2008
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
DUNHAM, JASON B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 16-31* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 16-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant amended claims 1, 24-27, and 31 in the response filed June 19, 2008.

The examine notes claim 31 will be treated as amended although current status

identifier indicates it was "previously presented". Claims 1-10 and 16-31 are pending.

Applicant's amendments rendered the previous 35 USC 112, second paragraph

rejection to claims 24, 27, and 30 moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 16-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Flores (US 6,058,413) in view of Bandych (US 2005/0177507).

Referring to claim 1. The combination of Flores and Bandych discloses a

method for automatically filing documents relating to business transactions, using a

computer system, the method comprising:

- Receiving business data about a business transaction (Flores: abstract);

- Producing at least one input data record from the business data, the input data

  record having a structure specific to a class of the business transaction (Flores:

  abstract, figures 4-6, and column 7, lines 44-61);

Flores discloses all of the above including storing individual output data with an identification code (column 9, lines 18-29) but does not expressly disclose transforming input into output data formatted for compatibility. Bandych discloses a method of processing transactions including:

- Transforming the at least one input data record into an output data record, comprising: formatting a first data area of the output data record, such that the first data area is compatible with a first business application, and formatting a second data area of the output data record such that the second data area is compatible with a second business application (Bandych: abstract and paragraphs 28 and 121). The examiner notes that Bandych discloses using identifiers to produce documents from the central system and converted to data that various trading partners can understand.

- Storing the output data record with an identification code such that the output data record is available to the first and second business applications by referring to the identification code (Bandych: paragraphs 121 and 132);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified the method of Flores, to have included producing different output records for different business applications depending on their data requirements, as taught by Bandych, in order to processing of transactions in a collaborative data set between different buying and selling entities (Bandych: abstract).

Referring to claims 2-6. Claims 2-6 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above. The combination of Flores and Bandych discloses a method of producing,

transforming, transferring, and storing the records of claim 1 through the use of program

modules via an interface (Flores: figures 3-4 and column 7, lines 4-20 and column 8,

lines 14-30).

Referring to claim 7. The combination of Flores and Bandych further discloses a

method wherein the output data record is stored on a transactional basis (Flores:

column 9, lines 18-29).

Referring to claim 8. The combination of Flores and Bandych further discloses a

method wherein the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications,

a database structure having one or more tables (Flores: table 2).

Referring to claim 9. The combination of Flores and Bandych further discloses a

method wherein the output data record includes, for different journals in accounting,

different data areas (Flores: column 3, line 47 – column 4, line 11). The examiner notes

that applicant's specification defines journals as tabular summaries of posting records,

separated for example into areas regarding costs, storage type and location, and

customer. Flores discloses separate database for recording sales price and quantity

ordered (Flores: column 9, lines 44-58).

Referring to claims 10 and 16-24. Claims 10 and 16-24 are rejected under the

same rationale set forth above. The combination of Flores and Bandych further

discloses a system and medium according to claims 10 and 16-24 as evidenced by the

cited portions in the rejection of the method claims and column 7, lines 4-20.

Referring to claim 25. The combination of Flores and Bandych further discloses

a method comprising adding data from a database application to the output data record

(Flores: figure 7 and page 23 disclosing the use of headers to address messages

related to business transactions).

Referring to claims 26-27. Claims 26-27 are rejected under the same rationale

set forth above.

Referring to claim 28. The combination of Flores and Bandych further discloses

a method wherein the first and second business applications each assess the business

transaction using different business management methods (Bandych: paragraph 67).

Bandych discloses various partners that do not use the same accounting information.

Referring to claims 29-31. Claims 29-31 are rejected under the same rationale

set forth above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the combination of Flores and Bandych does

not disclose the recited output record of claim 1. Applicant has cited a portion of

paragraph 121 of Bandych as evidence as that Bandych does not disclose the claimed

output record. For convenience, the whole of paragraph 121 (with reference to related

figure 10) is reproduced below:

> The trade integration module 192 links the central data center 182 to the various
> CBO systems at the buyer and seller sites. It essentially pulls data from the CBO
> system and provides data conversion and protocol layers to communicate the data to
> the central trade engine 182 and then onto the appropriate trading partners. The
> customer adapter module 194 is a piece of customer-specific code that links the CBO
> system (which is generic to all sellers or buyers) to a customer specific enterprise
> system through the system adapter 196. It also provides customer-specific alterations
> and/or customization of the CBO system, such as specific business rules, workflow or

validation procedures that may be unique to the particular customer. The system adapter 196 links to the customer's enterprise system and provides data conversion from the enterprise system format to the format expected by the CBO system, which is preferably in XML format.

Applicant argues that the communicated data of Bandych is only compatible with the trade engine 182 (figure 10) and does not include first and second data areas compatible with first and second business applications, respectively. The examiner disagrees as figure 10 is directed towards multiple buyer and sellers (i.e. business applications) with distinct customer adapters for data conversion (i.e. formatting) the common data center data into compatible enterprise data (see also paragraph 120).

Applicant further argues that Bandych does not disclose "a second data area" because the communicated data of Bandych only has a single destination (trade engine 182). The examiner disagrees as the trade engine sends out common data (i.e. output data record) which is then converted (i.e. formatted for compatibility) into enterprise data based on matching requirements (i.e. first and second data areas), as noted in paragraph 121. Independent claims 10, 24, and 31 and the dependent claims of 1, 10, and 24 are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JASON B. DUNHAM whose telephone number is

(571)272-8109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey A. Smith/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3625

JBD
9/15/08